

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claim 3 has been amended. Claims 1-26 remain in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims.

Claim 3 has been amended for antecedent basis.

**Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35USC102(b) as being anticipated by Ylijurva (US Patent No. 6140970).**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants would like to initially point out that although the Examiner rejected claims 1-26 based on Ylijurva, all of the Examiner's arguments refer to a patent issued to Na et al Pat. No 5825330. The figures and reference numerals cited by the Examiner appear to align with the Ylijurva patent. Applicants will address both references.

Applicants' claims recite a memory device. Neither of the cited reference teaches a memory device. Applicants have reviewed the passages cited by the Examiner, and further reviewed both patents in their entirety, and there is no teaching or suggestion of a memory device.

Both Na and Ylijurva teach human manipulated antennas. Both references teach dual-mode radiators with the mode change being by a mechanical change to the antenna by human interaction – pulling out the antenna whip for example. Both references deal with the motion of the antenna (figures 6B, 6C of Ylijurva) “move first antenna from stowed to ‘in use’ position”) and (figures 1A, 1B 2A, 2B of Na).. Applicants' invention does not pertain to retraction of an antenna, but rather the identification of an antenna through stored parameters.

Further to the memory device argument made above, the cited reference antennas apply to radios designed for only built-in antenna(s). Ylijurva describes switching between two built-in antennas. The antenna(s) in the cited reference are not changed out by a user of the radio. Applicants' invention, on the other hand, addresses the problem of a user coupling an incorrect antenna to a radio. For example, claim 24 recites:

An antenna for coupling to a portable communication device, the antenna comprising a memory device for storing antenna parameters, the radio determining whether a correct antenna has been coupled thereto based on the antenna parameters, and the radio providing an error message when an incorrect antenna has been coupled thereto.

Thus Applicants invention, as claimed, addresses the possibility that a user may attach an antenna that is not compatible with the user's radio. This scenario never happens in the case of Na or Ylijurva. Again, neither reference taken individually or combined teaches a memory element included within the physical antenna.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection is overcome. Claims 1-26 are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

September 22, 2006

Motorola, Inc.  
Customer Number 24273

By: /Barbara R. Doutre/  
Barbara R. Doutre  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 39,505  
Telephone: 954-723-6449  
Fax No.: 954-723-3871  
E-Mail: [docketing.florida@motorola.com](mailto:docketing.florida@motorola.com)